

Application No. 10/565,291
Amdt. Dated: January 24, 2009
Reply to Office Action Dated: October 31, 2008

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is thanked for the Office Action mailed October 31, 2008. The status of the application is as follows:

- Claims 1-16 and 18-27 are pending, claims 1, 7 and 8 have been amended, and claims 23- 25 have been added;
- Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph;
- Claims 1, 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Igarashi et al. (US 6,587,538 B2) in view of Adachi et al. (US 6,304,626 B1); and
- Claim 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Igarashi et al. in view of Adachi et al. and in further view of Tang (US 5,949,850).

The rejections are discussed below.

The Allowed Claims

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating claims 14-16 and 18-22 are allowed

The Rejection of Claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to **claims 1-13**, the Office states that the subject claims recite an anti-scatter module in a passive manner and thus it is unclear whether the two-dimensional radiation detector comprises an anti-scatter module. Claim 1 has been amended herein to overcome this rejection. As such, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

With respect to **claim 7**, the Office states that the subject claim recites “first strips parallel to anti-scatter vanes ...” and asserts that this limitation is indefinite since there is no claim language that positively claims a radiation detector that comprises ant-scatter vanes. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 7 depends from claim 6, which recites that the anti-scatter module of the two-dimensional radiation detector includes “a plurality of anti-scatter vanes...,” and claim 7 recites that the radiation absorbing mask includes “first strips parallel to the anti-scatter vanes.” Therefore, the anti-scatter vanes of claim 7 are positively

Application No. 10/565,291
Amdt. Dated: January 24, 2009
Reply to Office Action Dated: October 31, 2008

claimed in claim 6 and thus in claim 7. However, applicants have amended claim 7 to further emphasize the above. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 7 should be withdrawn.

With respect to **claim 8**, the Office states that the subject claim recites “second strips parallel to anti-scatter vanes . . .” and asserts that this limitation is indefinite since there is no claim language that positively claims a radiation detector that comprises ant-scatter vanes. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Similar to Claim 7, claim 8 depends from claim 6, which positively claims the anti-scatter vanes. Therefore, the anti-scatter vanes of claim 8 are positively claimed through claim 6. Like claim 7, applicants have amended claim 8 to further emphasize this. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 8 should be withdrawn.

The Rejection of Claims 1, 6, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1, 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Igarashi et al. in view of Adachi et al. This rejection should be withdrawn because the combination of Igarashi et al. and Adachi et al. does not teach or suggest all the limitations of the subject claims and, therefore, fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obvious with respect to the subject claims.

The rationale to support a conclusion that the claim would have been obvious is that all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed. *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. ____ (2007). MPEP §2143.

“All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385 (CCPA 1970). MPEP §2143.03.

Independent claim 1 is directed towards a two-dimensional radiation detector that includes, *inter alia*, ***a radiation absorbing mask formed as a grid*** and arranged between the array of the detector elements and the anti-scatter module. The Office relies on Adachi et al. to teach this claim aspect. However, Adachi et al. does not teach or suggest this claim aspect.

Adachi et al. instead discloses a mask 14 that includes a plurality of ***shield portions in line form, each extending substantially parallel to the channel direction*** to shield the edges of

Application No. 10/565,291
Amdt. Dated: January 24, 2009
Reply to Office Action Dated: October 31, 2008

the all of the x-rays detecting elements arranged in the channel direction from incident x-rays. (See Abstract; Figs. 4-8 and 10-11).

Thus, the mask 14 of Adachi et al. is not formed as a grid as recited in claim 1. Rather, it is formed of strips that are arranged parallel to each and that extend along a single direction. Accordingly, the combination of Igarashi and Adachi et al. does not teach or suggest the subject claim aspect, and this rejection should be withdrawn.

The Rejection of Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Igarashi et al. in view of Adachi et al. and further in view of Tang. This rejection should be withdrawn because the combination of Igarashi et al, Adachi et al., and Tang does not teach or suggest all the limitations of the subject claims and, therefore, fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obvious with respect to the subject claims.

Claim 9, which indirectly depends from claim 1, recites that the *radiation absorbing mask* (which is arranged between the array of the detector elements and the anti-scatter module) has stepped edges that interleave with stepped edges of adjacent radiation absorbing masks. The Office asserts Tang teaches this claim aspect in connection with FIG. 2. Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion. FIG. 2 of Tang relates to an *anti-scatter grid* (See column 8, line 60, to column 9, line 7) and not a radiation absorbing mask arranged between the anti-scatter module and an array of detector elements, as recited in claim 9.

Accordingly, this rejection of claim 9 should be withdrawn.

New Claims 23-25

Newly added claims 23-25 emphasize various aspects. No new matter has been added. The prior art of record does not teach or suggest the aspects in these claims. Entry and allowance of claims 23-25 is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/565,291
Am dt. Dated: January 24, 2009
Reply to Office Action Dated: October 31, 2008

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims distinguish patentably and non-obviously over the prior art of record. An early indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Anthony M. Del Zoppo, III Reg. No. 51,606
Driggs, Hogg, Daugherty & Del Zoppo Co., L.P.A.
38500 Chardon Road
Willoughby Hills, Ohio 44094
Phone: 1.440.391.5100
Fax: 1.440.391.5101

Direct all correspondence to:

Douglas B. McKnight, Reg. No. 50,447
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
595 Miner Road
Cleveland, Ohio 44143
Phone: 1.440.483.2373
Fax: 1.440.483.2452